

1 made your remarks, sir?

2 MR. GEORGE WOOD: No.

3 MR. THOMAS WICHMANN: Thank you.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your

5 comments, Mr. Wood.

6 I would like to remind you that you

7 could file written comments -- submit written

8 comments through a variety of ways. And all

9 comments are reviewed and considered and analyzed

10 by the Department of Energy and the State of

11 Idaho in preparing the Final Environmental Impact

12 Statement.

13 So, is anyone else in the room who has

14 not had an opportunity that would like to comment

15 formally this evening?

16 We'll let the record reflect that no one

17 has so indicated.

18 We will stand at ease, subject to call

19 of the hearing officer in the event that others

20 come who would like to comment. So, right now,

21 we'll be off the record.

22 (A recess was taken.)

23 THE FACILITATOR: We'll be back on the

24 record.

25 This is a continuation of the public

HLW & FD

Page

EIS PROJECT ARPF

Control # DC-38

1 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

2 IDAHO OPERATIONS OFFICES

3

4 IDAHO HIGH-LEVEL WASTE AND

5 FACILITIES DISPOSITION

6

7 Tuesday, February 22, 2000

8

9 Portland, Oregon

10

11 Doubletree Lloyd Center

12

13 5:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

ORIGINAL

1 If the court reporter is having
 2 trouble following you or keeping up, she may
 3 interrupt to ask you to either slow down or
 4 speak directly into the microphone.
 5 I will begin now the formal comment
 6 portion of tonight's hearing. I want to stress
 7 this is a formal hearing and a recorded
 8 proceeding with a full transcript being
 9 prepared.
 10 And finally, I would like to thank you
 11 all for attending and for your cooperation in
 12 observing the rules I set forth.
 13 The first speaker this evening is Ken
 14 Niles. Please step up to the microphone at the
 15 podium.
 16 KEN NILES: Good evening. I'm Ken
 17 Niles. I'm the Deputy Administrator of the
 18 Oregon Office of Energy's Nuclear Safety
 19 Division. I'm here on behalf of the State of
 20 Oregon.
 21 I do have some written comments, and I
 22 will provide those upon completion of my oral
 23 comments. And I'll read these. I would just
 24 like to sum them up.
 25 First off though, I would like to

1 deviate a bit from my prepared comments in my
 2 script to make a comment about the meeting
 3 format that we're having here tonight.
 4 [I would like to take issue with the
 5 rigidity of this format and say that I don't
 6 believe that it's fully serving the public's
 7 interests. The woman who spoke in the question
 8 and answer had a comment to make, had to leave,
 9 was not able to stay for this, and the fact that
 10 the comments that she made were not on the
 11 record, were not allowed to be on the record, I
 12 think that was a disservice to her, and I
 13 believe in keeping this type of rigid format, we
 14 don't fully serve the public, which is what we
 15 should be doing.]
 16 In terms of my comments, they will
 17 focus solely on the one aspect of the EIS. The
 18 draft EIS focuses on the proposals to bring
 19 high-level waste from Idaho to Hanford for
 20 vitrification.
 21 We are certainly, from the State of
 22 Oregon's perspective, directly impacted by
 23 activities that occur at Hanford. This is an
 24 issue that certainly draws our interest.
 25 [It is Oregon's position that it is

D-87

DOE/EIS-0287

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS

1 premature to consider bringing Idaho waste to
2 Hanford at this point for two reasons. First
3 that Hanford does not yet have vitrification
4 facilities, and second that once we do gain
5 those facilities, there is a pressing need to
6 treat Hanford's waste as soon as possible.

7 The discussions that we're having now
8 in terms of considering the ultimate state of
9 Idaho's waste and whether it should come to
10 Hanford are ones we have should have perhaps 45
11 years from now. It is, again, too premature.]

38-3
11.E(4)

12 [We recognize the financial constraints
13 that drives this issue, and it is certainly the
14 reason that Hanford is being looked at for
15 Idaho's waste. And given that we believe that
16 it may make sense down the road, in the future,
17 to discuss bringing waste from Idaho to Hanford
18 for treatment.] However, [even then in the

38-4
11.E(5)

19 distant future, the State of Oregon would not
20 consider treatment of Idaho high-level waste at
21 Hanford unless the following conditions were
22 met: First, Idaho waste would not be treated at
23 Hanford until all of Hanford's high-level waste
24 is treated; second, Idaho waste would not come
25 to Hanford until it is time for treatment;

38-6
11.E(6)

1 third, upon vitrification of Idaho's waste, it
2 must then be returned to Idaho or to a national
3 repository, if one is available. The treated
4 waste must not remain at Hanford; four, the
5 transportation of this waste both to and from
6 Idaho must adhere to enhanced transportation
7 safety protocols. And we would offer up those
8 as by developed by Western States for
9 transportation of transuranic waste as a model;
10 and fifth, Oregon must be allowed to participate
11 fully in Hanford decision making meetings in
12 order to assure these conditions are met.]

13 There isn't time to go into great
14 detail on each of these conditions that we
15 offer. Let me just highlight a couple of
16 issues. One is that Idaho waste not come to
17 Hanford early. The draft EIS suggests, at least
18 as we found, two possible time frames to bring
19 Idaho waste to Hanford. One beginning in 2028
20 or sometime thereafter, which presumably would
21 be after Hanford's waste has been vitrified.
22 The other talks about a window between 2012 and
23 2025 and building new storage facilities at
24 Hanford.

25
38-5
11.E(1)

[As we have heard, the calcine waste at

1 Idaho is in bin sets which have a design life of
2 500 years. There is no rush to get that out of
3 there. We believe it would be financially
4 irresponsible to squander many millions of
5 dollars on temporary storage facilities at
6 Hanford when the waste is safely stored in
7 Idaho.]

8 With that, I think I'll conclude my
9 comments, and again submit a written -- these
10 are preliminary comments. We will follow-up
11 with additional written comments that deal with
12 more with some of the technical aspects of the
13 EIS.

14 PETER RICHARDSON: Thank you for your
15 comments Mr. Niles.

16 I would like to take this opportunity
17 to note that I'll mark as Exhibit Number 1 to
18 this proceeding a multi-paged document
19 previously submitted to me by Mr. Wichmann
20 entitled "Tom's Talking Points - Portland Idaho
21 High-level Waste and Facilities Disposition
22 Draft and Environmental Impact Statement."

23 That will be marked as Exhibit number
24 1. Exhibit number 2 of this evening's
25 proceeding is a three-page document entitled

1 "Preliminary Comments of the State of Oregon on
2 the Idaho High-level Waste and Facilities
3 Disposition Draft Environmental Impact
4 Statement" dated February 22, 2000. That, we'll
5 mark as Exhibit number 2.

6 Our next scheduled commentator is Page
7 Knight.

8 PAGE KNIGHT: I don't have an
9 exhibit.

10 Yeah. I represent Hanford Watch here
11 in Portland -- the Portland area. And we --
12 this is sort of a new issue for us. It
13 certainly hasn't been on the top of our radar
14 screen because of the tremendous problems that
15 we're dealing with at Hanford right now and the
16 fact that we can't even, you know, get the U.S.
17 Department of Energy to agree to sign milestones
18 for a possible vitrification plant. And Lynn
19 Semmes who was here earlier mentioned that we
20 are very worried right now that BNFL may crash
21 in the United States with all the problems they
22 are having in England, and we may not have a
23 vitrification plant, and once again, be back to
24 ground zero.

25 So, I'm going to make some just